

day 1 almost and in 3 weeks will deliver the third set of unauditable books, or a failed audit, to the auditors.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right. And before I get to this, I will also add to that, what these failed audits represent is money failing to get to children in American schools. That is what matters the most.

Anyway, here is what he says today, the Secretary of Education, in his speech to the National Press Club: "We need to focus on what we like to call the three R's over at the Department of Education." You would think it would be reading, writing, and arithmetic like it is everywhere else in America. No, the three R's over at the Department of Education is relationships, resilience, and readiness. That is what the emphasis is over at the Department of Education.

Now, relationships, resilience and readiness are important things. I have no doubt about that. But in a Nation that squanders and wastes as much money as it does by giving it to the U.S. Department of Education and allowing that agency to get by without the ability to balance its books and the inability to get those precious dollars to children and a Nation that is lagging behind our international competitors in math and science, that is not right.

□ 1915

Mr. HOEKSTRA. For our colleagues, the information is clear on international testing. The U.S. comes out somewhere between 17th to 19th out of 21 industrialized countries. That is not good enough. That is not good enough for my kids. That is not good enough for your kids. On this, this is something that I am very selfish about. It is time to reinvent education so that our kids score the best in the world, and I hope everybody else in the world is on the same level as what we are; but it is unacceptable to have the rest of the world 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and it is kind of like, hey, where is the U.S.? we are down here 17th, 19th. It is not good enough, and it is unacceptable.

Mr. SCHAFFER. My point being is that in a Nation where we have unacceptable national test scores in comparison to our peer nations as industrial countries, in a country where we know we have problems in education in America, Americans would expect and should expect the leader of the U.S. Department of Education to acknowledge that we have a problem, we have got to get serious about it, and we have got to get focused on fixing it. The way that we usually do that back in your State and the State I grew up in Ohio, and the State I live in now, Colorado, and in virtually all other States in the union is we start focusing on the basics, getting the money to children and start focusing on reading, writing, and arithmetic. We can add to that a little bit, science and history and so on and so forth. But over at the Department of Education, as of today, our new goal is

to redefine, to reinvent the three Rs to be relationships, resilience, and readiness. I am not making this up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You get what you measure. If the Department of Education is now measuring relationships, resilience, and readiness, that is probably what we will get, at least from the programs and the emphasis, the programs that the Education Department funds. If that is reinventing government, I do not want it. I mean, I want my kids to know reading, writing and arithmetic. They need the basics.

Under the Department's definition of the three Rs, if we focus on, I cannot believe these three, relationships, resilience, and readiness, when we focus on those three, we get the fourth R, which is what we have also seen as we go around the country, we get remediation. When you focus on relationships, resilience, and readiness, we are going to get remediation. What is remediation? What remediation is, and this is when we have gone to our colleges and we find that one of the fastest growing programs on college campuses today is remediation because kids entering college cannot read or write at a ninth or 10th grade level or an eighth, ninth or 10th grade level, which means when they get to college they have got to be remediated to get their learning up to that level. And if remediation is one of the fastest growing programs on campus today, then it is time for us to re-evaluate as to whether relationships, resilience, and readiness are what we need to be focusing on.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I do not want to denigrate these concepts. These are important things, obviously. But for anyone in a position such as the Secretary of Education in the Clinton administration is, for anyone to be in the position that he is, to define for the Nation these goals as a replacement for the basics in education, it is an indication of why we are in trouble in America and why the U.S. Department of Education is frankly incapable of being part of the solution. It nine times out of 10 is actually the source of the problem. We just need to let professional teachers do the job they are trained to do and let parents have the liberty and freedom to place their children in the kinds of academic settings that earn the confidence of knowledgeable, loving parents. These are the people, after all, who know the names of the children and care about them most. I guarantee you that the Secretary of Education does not know the names of my kids, and he would have a good fight on his hands if he wanted to presume he cared about them more than I did.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. But this is reinventing government from maybe the Vice President's perspective, I am assuming that this is the position of the administration, this is the longest serving Cabinet member; and this is how they have now reinvented government, moving from the Department of Education which should be saying our,

I would think close to our only, our most important goal is academic excellence for each and every one of our children and we are not going to leave one behind and we are going to allow every child to achieve their full potential.

What we are now going to have under these measurements is a bunch of children who are going to have great relationships, they are going to be able to get along well, they are going to be prepared for not being able to have the basics and they are going to be able to bounce back and be resilient. This is not brain surgery. The Department of Education should be striving for academic excellence in each and every school in this country.

Mr. SCHAFFER. These are good goals, but they really mean a lot more if you are smart on top of that. There may be some citizens, some of our constituents perhaps, who would prefer that relationships, resilience, and readiness as the Clinton administration states should be more important and the goal of education rather than reading, writing and arithmetic, science, history and all the rest. I think there ought to be a school for those parents. I think there ought to be places around the country where teachers who agree with Secretary Riley, where Secretary Riley can send his grandkids, I suppose, where people who agree that these concepts are more important than real learning can send their own kids.

The problem is you have somebody with a goofy idea here in Washington that wants to impose these values on your children, my children, everybody else's children and it is just wrong. We do not get to vote for Secretary of Education. This is an appointed person. He does not hold town meetings in my neighborhood like I do or in your district like you do. He is not accountable to anyone in my district or anyone who is a parent of these kids who he thinks should be focusing on relationships, resilience, and readiness.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let us cut the Secretary a little bit of slack. We know exactly what he is talking about. Relationships. When you go into the workforce today, you recognize that many companies today are talking about participative management; they are talking about team concepts, being able to work in groups and those types of things and that is the relationship factor. But also coming out of a company that focused very heavily on teamwork, participative management and those types of things, you also knew that for somebody to get on the team, they had to have the basic skills to do the job and the assignment that they were given as part of that team. They did not get on the team because they could really relate well to you and because they were ready and because they were resilient. They were on the team first and foremost because they had the skills to do the job that was required, and the teamwork part came second.